IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IDHN FOIKS, Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION NO. 07-334XXX

V.

THOMAS CARROLL, worden et al, Respondent.

Petitioner request Permission by Leave of the Court to Amend the Following arguments. Argument (2) - Section - H. IN Petitioner's Memorandum of Law, Pages - 13, 14 and 15. And argument (8) - section Q, In Memo, Pager - 33+34

Now Comes Petitioner John Folks, who moves this Honorable Court by Leave of the Court, also Pursuant to Rule 15(A) which govern amendments for and within the United STATES DISTRICT COURT, Requesting Permission to amend Petitioner's memorandum of Law in Support of Petitioner's HABEAS CORPUS MOTION.

Date: 9-25-07

John Folks-Pro-se John Folks-fro-se D. C.C. 1191 Paddock Rd. Smyona, Del. 19977 The fetitioner Respectfully request the court's consideration on the Following Amended Portion in support of Petitioner's memorandum:

Alternet

(H) I. Petitioner's counsel (Bernard 3. D'Donnell was grossly ineffective when he intentionally relinguised a known right; "coilateral estoppel". That vitimate fact (±dentity of Prior conviction) that Mr. o'Donnell conceded too, was once determined by a valid and final Judgment, and that issue should not have been Re-Litigated within Petitioner's Case; see: John Folks v. state, Del., 892 A 2d 1083 (a) (176), Due to counsel's decision to intentionally relinguish Petitioner's Known Tight; he infringed upon the Petitioner's constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel; and as a result allowed the court to enhance the Petitioner's sentence to 20 years.

2. As in the case out bar the doctrine of Collateral Estoppel Precluded the Re-Litigation in a subsequent Goes with Section It in memo, of how, Pages-14

Case 1:07-cv-00334-JJF Document 25 Filed 09/27/2007 Page 3 of 7 Criminal Prosecution of question decided by a former Judgment IN a criminal case. Defense afterney should seasonally object to the introduction of evidence bearing on the guestion of facts Previously decided. Although anyone may forgo a right Intended for his own benefit in the absence of some rule of Public Policy; the Instant case reflects the contrary. When MR. o' Donnell Conceded to that conviction that was deemed insufficient by the belowane supreme court for the habitual offender Status; (see: John Folks v. state, Del., 872 A. 20 959 (a) (12)) his unreasonable conduct allowed the Judge to use that (invalid conviction), as a aggravating factor (For enhancement Purposes) to impose an excessive sentence thus causing a detrimental effect by Lost of Liberty to Petitioner, see; Nathan Miller INC V. Northern INS. Co. of New York, Del, 523, 39 A. 28 23,

Thouse right, either in term or by such conduct as chearly indicates an intention to revoluce a known fruitege or fower, IT involves both knowledge and intent, and is based on the idea of consent express or implied. Counsel had knowledge that without the prior conviction; the letitioner was facing if to 6 years, the enhancement of the Prior

Goes with section H IN Memor of Law, Reges - 13,142

Case 1:07-cv-00334-JJF Document 25 Filed 09/27/2007 Page 4 of 7 Conviction concelled to by counsel, and used 05 a catalyst for the enhancement — caused the sentence statute to increase to 10 to 20 years, with 10 years being mandatory. This act of concedement rendered counsels representation ineffective and thus violated Retitioner's constitutional right. See: strickland U. washing ton, 466 U.S. 668, 104 5. Ct. 2052, 2064-74, 80 L. Ed 2d 674 (1984).

5

Coes with section H IN Memo of Law, Reges-18,18

in support of Argument (8) - Section Q. Within Retitioner's memorandum of Law

the Petitioner Respectfully request the Court's consideration on the Pollowing Amended Portion in suppor of Petitioner's memorandum:

ARbument

- (a) 1. The Petitioner argues that the trial court knowingly and Purposely Placed Petitioner in Bouble Teopardy, because the trial court know it was collateral Estoppel from considering a 1977 conviction that was acready Litigated on once before between the Petitioner and the state. Collateral estopped simply means that when an issue of Utimote fact has once been determined by a valid and Rinal Judgment, that I sove cannot again be Litigated between same parties in any Puture According-see: (Ashe v. stevenson, 397 U.S. 436, 90 S. Ct. 1189).
- 2. Article 1, section 8 of the Delaware constitution Provider 7N part that "No Person Shall be for the same

Car is the section of IN memor OF Law Regar - 33234

Case 1:07-cv-00334-JJF Document 25 Filed 09/27/2007 Page 6 of 7

OFFense twice put IN Jeopardy of Like or Limb. Principal of double Seopardy, which are Limited to the criminal confermance subsumed by the broader doctrive of culleteral estoppel, see; (Monther V. State, Del., 884 A.2d 487).

Couclusion

The Petitioner reguest relief in the interest

Respectfully submitted

Date: 9-25-07

John Talks-Pro-se John Folks-Pro-se 1181 Paddock Load Smyrna, Del. 19977

Goes with section Q IN Memo, of Law, Reges-33+34

SBI# 126239 UNIT Mhu-20
DELAWARE CORRECTIONAL CENTER
1181 PADDOCK ROAD
SMYRNA, DELAWARE 19977

MR. Peter T. DALLED - Clerk of the court United States District Court 844 King Street, LockBox-18 LECAL MAIL